

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

SOLANGE CHADDA,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

TOM BLOCK,

Defendant and Respondent.

B216122

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BC381503)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Alan S. Rosenfield, Judge. Affirmed.

Solange Chadda, in pro. per, for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Law Offices of Terry M. Magady and Terry M. Magady for Defendant and Respondent.

\* \* \* \* \*

In this case arising from a trustee's sale after foreclosure of a deed of trust, appellant Solange Chadda filed a notice of appeal from the trial court's award of summary judgment in favor of respondent Tom Block. Appellant is appearing in propria persona. Appellant's appeal is deficient in several respects and she has failed to meet her burden of demonstrating reversible error. We therefore affirm the summary judgment.

Rule 8.204(a)(2)(A) of the California Rules of Court,<sup>1</sup> requires that an appellant's opening brief must state "the nature of the action." Rule 8.204(a)(2)(C) requires the opening brief to provide "a summary of the significant facts limited to matters in the record." Appellant's opening brief fails to meet either of these mandatory requirements. First, the nature of the case is not clear from her brief. The lack of any copies of the complaint and the summary judgment pleadings in appellant's appendix make this omission all the more significant. Second, appellant's summary of facts focuses almost entirely on alleged criminal acts by respondent, his attorney, appellant's attorney and others, which form no part of the basis of her complaint. We also note that appellant has not limited her discussion to matters in the record. She cites to exhibits in her appendix that are dated after the judgment in this case, and therefore were presumably never part of the trial court record.

Although respondent has included copies of the complaint and the summary judgment pleadings in his appendix, these documents do not assist appellant. Rule 8.204(a)(1)(C) requires a brief to support "any reference to a matter in the record by a citation to the volume and page number of the record where the matter appears." Because appellant's brief does not include a single citation to these relevant pleadings, they offer no support to her appeal. It is well established that "[i]f a party fails to support an argument with the necessary citations to the record, . . . the argument [will be] deemed to have been waived. [Citation.]" (*Nwosu v. Uba* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1229, 1246.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all references to rules shall be to the California Rules of Court.

In addition, rule 8.204(a)(1)(B) requires all appellate briefs to support each point, if possible, by citation of authority. The few legal citations appellant makes are mostly incomplete and appear to be out-of-state cases and statutes that do not advance her position. “We need not consider an argument for which no authority is furnished.” (*Dabney v. Dabney* (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 379, 384; *Heiner v. Kmart Corp.* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 335, 350–351.)

Most importantly, appellant’s brief violates rule 8.204(a)(1)(B), which requires each brief to “support each point by argument.” Appellant’s primary argument as to why the trial court allegedly committed error in granting the motion for summary judgment is that triable issues of material fact remain. But appellant never identifies the triable issues she asserts remain. Indeed, appellant never mentions the fact that she failed to file opposition to the summary judgment motion.<sup>2</sup> This fact is made clear by the trial court’s order granting summary judgment. But the trial court’s order went further and identified seven additional reasons as to why respondent was entitled to summary judgment with citations to the evidence. Appellant addresses none of these reasons on appeal.

The fact that appellant is appearing in propria persona does not exempt her from these mandatory requirements. Litigants appearing in propria persona are not entitled to special exemptions from the California Rules of Court or Code of Civil Procedure and are held to the same standard as a litigant represented by counsel. (*Gamet v. Blanchard* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1276, 1284; *Nwosu v. Uba, supra*, 122 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1246–1247.)

We recognize that on appeal from a summary judgment we review the record de novo to determine whether the moving party met its burden of proof. (*Aguilar v. Atlantic*

---

<sup>2</sup> It appears from the reporter’s transcript of the hearing on the summary judgment motion that appellant’s attorney had filed a motion for relief under Code of Civil Procedure section 473, subdivision (b), seeking permission to file a late opposition. After hearing argument on the matter, the trial court denied the motion for relief. No copy of the section 473 motion is included in the record on appeal, and appellant has not raised the issue of the trial court’s ruling on this motion or made any arguments with respect to this issue. She has therefore forfeited her right to do so.

*Richfield Co.* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 826, 860; *Artiglio v. General Electric Co.* (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 830, 835.) “But this de novo review does not obligate us to cull the record for the benefit of the appellant in order to attempt to uncover the requisite triable issues. As with an appeal from any judgment, it is the appellant’s responsibility to affirmatively demonstrate error and, therefore, to point out the triable issues the appellant claims are present by citation to the record and any supporting authority. In other words, review is limited to issues which have been adequately raised and briefed. [Citations.]” (*Lewis v. County of Sacramento* (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 107, 116.)

In conclusion, we find that appellant failed to meet her burden on appeal of showing that the trial court erred. “When an issue is unsupported by pertinent or cognizable legal argument it may be deemed abandoned and discussion by the reviewing court is unnecessary.” (*Landry v. Berryessa Union School Dist.* (1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 691, 699–700.)

### **DISPOSITION**

The summary judgment in favor of respondent is affirmed. Respondent is entitled to recover his costs on appeal.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

\_\_\_\_\_, J.

DOI TODD

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_, P. J.

BOREN

\_\_\_\_\_, J.

ASHMANN-GERST